

EDMONDS CITY COUNCIL APPROVED MINUTES

September 23, 2014

The Edmonds City Council meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor Earling in the Council Chambers, 250 5th Avenue North, Edmonds.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Dave Earling, Mayor
Diane Buckshnis, Council President
Kristiana Johnson, Councilmember
Lora Petso, Councilmember
Strom Peterson, Councilmember
Joan Bloom, Councilmember
Adrienne Fraley-Monillas, Councilmember
Thomas Mesaros, Councilmember

ALSO PRESENT

Noushyal Eslami, Student Representative

STAFF PRESENT

Phil Williams, Public Works Director
Carrie Hite, Parks & Recreation Director
Scott James, Finance Director
Shane Hope, Development Services Director
Patrick Doherty, Econ. Dev & Comm. Serv. Dir.
Rob Chave, Planning Manager
Frances Chapin, Arts & Culture Program Mgr.
Leif Bjorback, Building Official
Rob English, City Engineer
Jeff Taraday, City Attorney
Scott Passey, City Clerk
Gerrie Bevington, Camera Operator
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

1. CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PER RCW 42.30.140(1)(a)

At 6:30 p.m., Mayor Earling announced that the City Council would meet in executive session regarding collective bargaining per RCW 42.30.140(1)(a). He stated that the executive session was scheduled to last approximately 30 minutes and would be held in the Jury Meeting Room, located in the Public Safety Complex. No action was anticipated to occur as a result of meeting in executive session. Elected officials present at the executive session were: Mayor Earling, and Councilmembers Johnson, Fraley-Monillas, Buckshnis, Peterson, Petso, Bloom and Mesaros. Others present were City Attorney Jeff Taraday, Parks & Recreation/Human Resources Reporting Director Carrie Hite and Public Works Director Phil Williams, Human Resources Manager MaryAnn Hardie and City Clerk Scott Passey. The executive session concluded at 6:57 p.m.

Mayor Earling reconvened the regular City Council meeting at 7:00 p.m. and led the flag salute.

2. ROLL CALL

City Clerk Scott Passey called the roll. All elected officials were present.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COUNCIL PRESIDENT BUCKSHNIS, MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA IN CONTENT AND ORDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

COUNCIL PRESIDENT BUCKSHNIS MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON, TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. The agenda items approved are as follows:

- A. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2014**
- B. APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #210337 THROUGH #210346 DATED SEPTEMBER 4, 2014 FOR \$26,625.76, CLAIM CHECK #210347 DATED SEPTEMBER 5, 2014 AND CLAIM CHECKS #210348 THROUGH #210517 DATED SEPTEMBER 11, 2014 TOTAL \$2,423,039.38. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL DIRECT DEPOSIT AND CHECKS #61167 THROUGH #61178 FOR \$467,673.17 AND #61188 FOR \$750.01, BENEFIT CHECKS #61179 THROUGH #61187 FOR \$91,649.44 AND WIRE PAYMENTS FOR \$312,987.24 FOR THE PERIOD OF AUGUST 16, 2014 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2014**
- C. APPROVAL OF CLAIM CHECKS #210519 THROUGH #210629 DATED SEPTEMBER 18, 2014 FOR \$253,666.59. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL DIRECT DEPOSIT AND CHECKS (REPLACEMENT CHECK #61065 THROUGH #61066) #61069 THROUGH #61085 FOR \$476,165.93, BENEFIT CHECKS #61068, #61086 THROUGH #61094 AND WIRE PAYMENTS OF \$423,990.52 FOR THE PERIOD JUNE 16, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2014**

5. ARBOR DAY PROCLAMATION

Mayor Earling commented on efforts to develop a tree program. He read a proclamation declaring October 4, 2014 Arbor Day in Edmonds and presented the proclamation to Tree Board Chair Susan Paine. Chair Paine identified several members of the Tree Board in the audience. The Arbor Day Foundation encourages cities and towns to become a Tree City USA. Edmonds has been a Tree City USA since 2012 and is seeking a growth award this year. Designation as a Tree City USA requires the proclamation. She provided a brief update on the Tree Board's activities:

- A consultant, Elizabeth Walker, is developing a Community Tree Plan as well as working on the tree code
- The Heritage Tree Program is nearly complete and will be presented to the Council late this year or early next year

She invited the public to join the Tree Board at the Summer Market on Saturday, October 4. They will have the Tree City USA flag on display as well as plants and information regarding trees.

6. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Denise Wexler, Edmonds, said she supports development at Westgate and feels it could be a win-win. She urged the Council to reflect on the uniqueness of Edmonds; people come to Edmonds due to its small town feel. She referred to Carol Sanford's Story of Place, suggesting all sides collaborate on developing Edmonds' story in a way that ensures a livable community and prosperity for all. This intersection is a gateway to the City and she suggested creating a feeling of welcome, an area similar to outdoor business areas in California, Colorado, Mill Creek or University Village. She urged the Council not to rush and end up with something like Kirkland or Ballard and not to replicate the mistakes made at the Compass Apartments. She supported the proposal for mixed use housing, finding Westgate an appropriate location for a limited number of apartments. She expressed concerns with traffic, tenants' ingress and egress onto SR-104 during peak hours, access to apartments, and parking. She inquired about the Chambers of Commerce's opinion about new businesses at Westgate and the impact it would have on struggling

businesses downtown. She summarized change is inevitable and ultimately good if done right. She urged the Council to make thoughtful, creative and deliberative decisions and modifications to the existing plan.

Stephen Clifton, Edmonds, referred to Councilmember Bloom's September 14, 2014 post in My Edmonds News, "I do not wear the crown, Mayor Earling wears the crown and he has the entire staff available to support his position. None of directors working on this plan, including the former Acting Development Services Director live in Edmonds. They will not feel the effect of the Westgate development personally. This isn't their city, it's just their jobs." If Councilmember Bloom truly believes this isn't their city, it's just their jobs, he said it is a sad reflection on what an elected official will say get their point across. That statement demeans City employees who have degrees, professional careers and passion, employees who spend over eight hours of each work day in addition to many evenings and weekends serving the Edmonds community, employees who are invested in the City and have established relationships with citizens, community groups, property owners, Councilmembers and the Mayor over many years, and reduces the reason they work for City down to a paycheck. Councilmember Bloom's statement told City staff they lack integrity; they couldn't possibly be presenting information or proposals based on their professional assessment or for the good of the community because it's just their jobs. While employed by Edmonds, he considered it a privilege and assured City employees care as deeply as he does about the Edmonds community and the outcomes, projects and proposals they work on. He never sensed that any Edmonds employee living in another community was working just for a paycheck or that they cared any less because they didn't live in Edmonds. He suggested Councilmember Bloom's thinking could be applied to the appointment of non-residents to boards or commissions and questioned whether she objected to Councilmember Petso's appointment of a Seattle resident to the Economic Development Commission (EDC) a few months ago. He urged the Westgate plan not be referred to as the Mayor's or a staff-driven plan; the plan was initiated by the EDC and the Planning Board and staff's role has been to facilitate the process.

Ken Reidy, Edmonds, relayed he has received no response to numerous requests to Council President Buckshnis, Mayor Earling and City Engineer Rob English to meet with him. He has sent Mayor Earling over 300 emails since March 2012 and he has not acknowledged or responded to any of them; common courtesy would require a response. He relayed a situation in front of the Hearing Examiner, where the Hearing Examiner was provided the law that protected a building, proof and evidence that the building had existed since the 1960s, yet the City Attorney told the Hearing Examiner that grandfathering applies to legally initiated uses not illegally uses. He disagreed with that statement, referring to the ordinance the Council passed this year grandfathering AT&T's illegally initiated use. Ordinance 3696 passed in August 2008 directly applies to his building and was discussed in a staff meeting, yet staff pursued code enforcement for his building. He asked Council President Buckshnis and Mayor Earling to contact him.

Ron Wambolt, Edmonds, added to Mr. Clifton's comments regarding Councilmember Bloom's post, pointing out Mr. Clifton has been a resident of Edmonds for several years.

7. **UPDATE ON EDMONDS ARTS COMMISSION TEMPORARY ART PROJECTS ON 4TH AVENUE CULTURAL CORRIDOR**

Arts & Culture Program Manager Frances Chapin commented the narrow street that connects the Edmonds Center for the Arts (ECA) to the downtown retail area has long been considered a unique and special part of the downtown community. The intersection of 4th & Main was a commercial center in Edmonds' early history and is still a commercial center. Homes along 4th Avenue are typical of the early town, anchored at the north end by the original high school campus, a portion of which remains as the ECA. For the past ten years the community has identified this corridor as a special place with the vision of making it a great place. Great places make everyone feel welcome, provide an opportunity to learn through observation and interaction and invite closer attention.

She described 2009 4th Avenue Plan Elements

- Curbless roadway and walkway
- Bollards define pedestrian and auto space
- Trees and plantings throughout
- Lighting elements throughout
- Wayfinding and/or art throughout
- Define intersections
- Small park at Sprague
- Visual connection from ECA to south of Main

Ms. Chapin described 2014 Temporary Art Projects:

- Interim or temporary art projects identified as important strategy for 4th Avenue Cultural Corridor in 2014 approved Community Cultural Plan
- EAFF and Arts Commission contracted with artist Benson Shaw to research and provide information on potential temporary art treatments along the corridor
- Edmonds Arts Commission convened stakeholders group and established advisory committee representing businesses, property owners, and residents
- Edmonds Arts Commission approved committee suggestions at August 2014 meeting.

She highlighted 2009 Elements in the 2014 Temporary Art Projects:

- Lighting Elements throughout
- Wayfinding and/or art throughout
- Define intersection
- Small part
- Visual connection from ECA to south of Main
- Parklet

She displayed photographs of graphic sidewalks elements, decorative crosswalks, and lights/finials to mark the path. She displayed a map of the 4th Avenue Corridor identifying potential locations for these elements. She reviewed next steps

- Artist designs developed
- Advisory group and Arts Commission review with artist team in public meeting
- Develop schedule for phased implementation
- Implement selected elements beginning fall 2014
- Temporary art elements complete by July 2015
- Parklet concept design, funding and implementation process begin winter 2015 for completion in the summer

She identified members of the stakeholders group in the audience including Steve Shelton, Darlene McLellan and Clayton Moss.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas commented a lot of creativity went into providing a new and improved 4th Avenue. She recalled reducing traffic on the road was part of the plan. Ms. Chapin recalled the discussion about parking was in regard to the 2009 plan that included some traffic revision. This proposal is only temporary elements; two parking spaces would be lost at the corner of Sprague for the parklet. Those parking spaces are heavily used during the summer market but not much during other times. The width of the road may allow angle parking; that would be part of the parklet planning process. The 2009 plan proposed the block between Bell and Main be one way because the intersection at 4th & Main is a dangerous intersection. The temporary project does not change anything in the roadway other than adding

decorative elements. Cities have found the addition of crosswalks and decorative elements slows traffic. That is a potential result of the project but is not the main goal.

Council President Buckshnis commended the Arts Commission for this project as well as the historic art markers. Ms. Chapin recognized the artist Judith Caldwell who designed the historic markers.

8. **PRESENTATION ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES**

Development Services Director Shane Hope explained Development Services is building, engineering and planning. This department requires a great deal of teamwork and interaction with the public. The City's regulations do not always make everyone happy but staff does a good job of trying to do the right thing within the regulations and standards. Staff is often complimented about the way they go above and beyond; she expressed her appreciation to staff.

She provided examples of what happens in the office and in the field:

- Inspections – approximately 6,000 field inspections were performed by building inspectors, engineering inspector and planning staff
- Staff meetings – teamwork
- Development Review Committee Meetings – staff providing pre-application assistance for development projects being planned

Building Official Leif Bjorback reviewed a graph of building permits and revenue January – August 2001-2014, highlighting trends over last decade, the high times in mid-2000s, the economic slump in 2009-2010, and upward trends in recent years. He commented revenue in 2014 from building permits and reviews is up and is anticipated to make a dramatic jump when a couple major commercial permits are released. He noted building permit activity has not fluctuated as much as revenue; during down times there is still activity but not as much money is spent on construction.

He displayed 2014 permits issued through August:

| Type of Permit | # Issued |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| New | |
| Single family | 33 |
| Duplex | 0 |
| Apartment/Condo | 0 |
| Commercial | 2 |
| Mixed use (office/condo) | 1 |
| Additions/Alterations | |
| Single family | 60 |
| Apartment/Condo | 9 |
| Commercial | 43 |
| Other | |
| Mechanical/Plumbing | 129/133 |
| Demolition | 15 |
| Miscellaneous | 270 |
| Total | 804 |

He displayed Solar Panel Permits

| Year | Number of Permits | Number of Permits Applied for Online | Number of Permits Applied for at Counter |
|-------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 2012 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 2013 | 6 | 51 | |

| | | | |
|--------------|----|----|---|
| 2014 to date | 27 | 23 | 4 |
|--------------|----|----|---|

Mr. Bjorback explained the Engineering Division is heavily involved in the building permit process as well as engineering permits for right-of-way, street use, encroachment and side sewer activity. He provided engineering permits for the period September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014:

- Engineering permits issued: 591
- Total permit fees: \$83,285.44
- Inspections performed: 1,094
- Total inspection fees: \$124,815.82
- Estimated reviews: 1,200

He displayed a map identifying key development projects and provided photographs of current projects, advising that the Development Services Department currently has 544 active issued building permits; of those, 52 are active single family residence permits. Mr. Bjorback and Ms. Hope displayed photographs and described:

- Swedish Hospital 3-story parking garage,
 - 108,990 square feet
 - \$8.4 million in valuation
 - Completed June 2014
- Swedish Hospital Expansion
 - 94,117 square foot expansion
 - Emergency department on first level
 - Tenant space on second level
 - \$28 million in valuation
- New Post Office Mixed use Building
 - 94,256 square feet
 - 43 residential units, post office and retail space
 - \$7.2 million in valuation
 - 2 phases
 - Post office remains intact during phase 1
 - In phase 2, post office moves into tenant space, old post office demolished and replaced by new building
- Community Health Center
 - 24,750 square feet
 - Medical and dental center
 - \$2.6 million in valuation
 - Completed July 2014
- Salish Crossing
 - Complete remodel providing five new tenant spaces and museum, parking lot and pedestrian improvements
 - 21,000 square feet
- Jacobsen's Marine
 - New 10,120 square foot marine services building
 - \$810,000 in valuation
- Prestige Care
 - New 48,782 square foot skilled nursing facility on 76th Avenue W
 - \$6.9 million in valuation
 - Demolish down old building, new building 50% larger
 - New approach to skilled nursing - less institutional more livable.
- 5th Avenue Animal Hospital
 - 10,561 square foot veterinary clinic

- \$891,000 valuation

Mr. Bjorback explained plan review traditionally required a lot of paper. The department is transitioning to new technology, outfitting all plan reviewers with new electronic plan review software which requires larger monitors and dual monitors. A number of jurisdictions are doing electronic plan review, there is a high demand for it in the industry, it requires less travel for the applicants, and correspondence between the City and applicant is easier and more clear. Overall it increases efficiency and reduces the carbon footprint.

Councilmember Johnson commented she found this a very comprehensive and interesting presentation and suggested it be provided to the Economic Development Commission. She asked how often Ms. Hope planned to provide this update. Ms. Hope answered she would like to provide an update twice a year.

Council President Buckshnis inquired about progress on the Green Resources Center. Ms. Hope explained a design for the space is being developed. Some offices had to be moved and there are plans to have professional help with translating the design ideas and building the Green Resources Center this fall.

Councilmember Mesaros echoed Councilmember Johnson's comments, finding this a good report with good information. He agreed providing the update twice a year would be beneficial.

Councilmember Peterson asked whether Solarize South County was aware of the City's online permitting process. Mr. Bjorback advised he and Mr. Chave have been involved in Solarize South County including assisting with the selection of a contractor and Mr. Chave is continuing as part of the outreach effort for the campaign. They are aware of the City's online permitting process.

9. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON THE 2015-2020 CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN/CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROCESS

City Engineer Rob English advised the packet contains staff responses to several questions raised by Councilmembers in recent weeks. He explained both the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) and the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) documents are team effort; Public Works takes the lead in compiling the information, Parks & Recreation, Development Services and Finance contribute to the documents and can address questions during the review and approval process. The draft CFP/CIP will be presented to the Planning Board tomorrow at a public hearing. A Council study session is scheduled on October 14 which will include any revisions recommended by the Planning Board.

Mr. English provided a comparison of the CIP and CFP:

| | CIP | CFP |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------------|
| Mandate | None | GMA |
| Reason | Budget | GMA |
| Time Frame | 6 years | 6 year 20 year |
| Must include Capital | Yes | Yes |
| Must include Maintenance? | Yes | No |

Mr. English provided a diagram showing components found only in the CIP and only in the CFP and components found in both the CIP and CFP. The CIP contains 6-year maintenance projects with funding sources, the CFP contains long range (20-year) capital project needs, both contain 6-year capital projects with funding sources.

The 2015-2020 CFP contains three project sections:

- General
 - Parks, building and regional projects
- Transportation
 - Safety capacity and pedestrian/bicycle
- Stormwater

Mr. English provided a summary of CIP fund numbers and the department managing each fund:

| Fund | Description | Department |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 112 | Transportation | Public Works |
| 113 | Multimodal Transportation | Community Services |
| 116 | Buildings Maintenance | Public Works |
| 125 | Capital Projects Fund | Parks & Recreation/Public Works |
| 126 | Special Capital/Parks Acquisition | Parks & Recreation/Public Works |
| 129 | Special Projects | Parks & Recreation |
| 132 | Parks- Construction (Grant Funding) | Parks & Recreation |
| 421 | Water Projects | Public Works |
| 422 | Storm Projects | Public Works |
| 423 | Sewer Projects | Public Works |
| 423 | Wastewater Treatment Plant | Public Works |

Mr. English reviewed the CFP/CIP timeline

- July
 - City staff begins development of capital budgets
- August
 - Submit proposed capital budget to Finance
 - Prepare draft CFP and CIP
- September
 - Present draft CFP and CIP to Planning Board at public hearing
- October
 - Present revised CFP and CIP to City Council
- November/December
 - Council public hearing and approval
 - Amend the Comprehensive Plan to include the CFP

Councilmember Petso asked how the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) fits into this. She recalled the SR-104 crosswalk was include in the TIP but was not in the CFP or the CIP. Mr. English answered the TIP is on a slightly different timeline; the approval deadline is July 1. Staff typically presents the TIP to the Council in early June. Any changes to the TIP are incorporated into the CFP and CIP during the annual update process to make them consistent.

Councilmember Bloom commented the SR-104 crosswalk was in the 2013 TIP but was not in 2014 CFP and CIP, yet it still was funded. She asked how a project that was not in the CFP or CIP could be funded. Mr. English explained that was an opportunity to leverage a State project. The State received a grant to build the crosswalk. The project was managed by Washington State Department of Transportation and had citizen support. At the time the project was being awarded, the State asked the City for funds to help with the award of project. A decision made and funds were allocated to the project.

Councilmember Bloom said her concern was the fact that it was never on the CFP or CIP. A citizen contacted WSDOT and learned it was an Edmonds generated project, yet the TIP stated it was completely State funded. She was concerned that this project suddenly appeared and asked how the City could seek

funds from the State when it was not in the CFP. Public Works Director Phil Williams responded a lot of people had significant interest in improving the crosswalk.

Councilmember Bloom said that was not her question; she wanted to know how funding could be sought for a project without going through Council when the CFP and CIP come to the Council and Planning Board for public hearing. Mr. Williams responded there has been a great deal of interest in improving the pedestrian crossing experience at Pine Street. As it is a State route, staff contacted the State in an effort to convince them it was a meritorious project, not knowing whether the outcome would be the City building the crossway with funds from the State or if the State would construct the crosswalk with their own internal funding. It was included in the 2013 CIP; when the 2014 CIP was prepared, it was clear it would be a State project and it was not included in the City's CIP. It was only when the bids were significantly higher than the available funds and the State contacted Edmonds for additional funds when they needed a local partner to pursue internal funding. That project will begin construction next week. Councilmember Bloom said a WSDOT announcement stated the project has been delayed until spring 2015. Mr. Williams advised that announcement was a mistake; the project is starting next week.

Councilmember Bloom expressed concern that this particular project was never vetted by Council, it was never the subject of a public hearing, and it was never on the CIP or CFP. In reviewing the proposed 2015-2020 CFP/CIP, she found several projects from \$35,000 to \$300,000. This project is \$320,000 allocated to crosswalk that is 0.3 miles from an existing safe crosswalk and signal at Dayton Street and SR-104. She summarized, in essence without Council approval or any public hearing, public funds in the amount of \$320,000 were allocated for a crosswalk so that people from Pt. Edwards didn't have to walk 0.3 miles down to the crossing at Dayton Street and SR-104. Mr. Williams agreed it was not on the CFP/CIP. It was on the City's program in the past, but was removed when it became a State project. The State received a grant for the project that was not enough and they asked for assistance from Edmonds. He absolutely believed it was a meritorious, important project and would improve safety at Pine Street. A lot of people who seek to cross SR-104 at that location are headed east of SR-104, not downtown. It would be much easier to cross at Pine Street at a safe crossing than to walk 0.3 mile to use the existing crosswalk and 0.3 mile back to get 50 feet from where a person started.

Councilmember Bloom commented the crossing is not at Pine Street, it is ¼ mile down from Pine Street and 0.3 mile from Dayton. Mr. Williams explained it was not safe to place the crosswalk at Pine Street due to the speed of vehicles coming down the hill and around the corner; therefore, it was moved 200-300 feet south from the centerline of Pine Street to get clear sight distances.

Council President Buckshnis asked what concerns arise when the administration has an opportunity to leverage funds but the project does not appear in any formal documents. City Attorney Jeff Taraday answered a policy decision needs to be made whereby the Council decides how much leeway they want to give administration to act on these types of opportunities when they arise. If the Council wanted to draft its budget documents and CFP and CIP documents so tightly that the administration has no leeway, that could be done but it comes at the cost of not being able to pursue these types of opportunities. Historically the City's documents have not been drafted so tightly to legally prevent this from happening. He summarized there was a legitimate policy question whether the administration should be given some leeway so they can act quickly to pursue things like this when they arise.

Council President Buckshnis said she thought that was done via the policy adopted that following Haines Wharf that set limits for contracts that must be reviewed by Council. She asked whether that policy needed to be refined. Mr. Taraday answered Haines Wharf was a completely separate issue; that was related to a contracting limit that requires administration to bring change orders to the Council.

For Council President Buckshnis, Mr. Taraday explained there is a difference between applying for and accepting a grant. The City is not under any obligation to accept grant funds once it a grant is awarded although the City would look bad to the granting agencies and potentially lose credibility if it rejected grants on a regular basis. He has noticed the Council and administration may not be on the same page about how to pursue grant funds and that a great deal of the frustration and tension regarding projects often stems from a grant application. It is a chicken and egg problem, what authority if any should the administration have to pursue grants; whether a project needs to be on a particular list in order to pursue a grant. There is legitimate policy debate the Council needs to have regarding these questions.

Mr. Taraday commented another issue is prioritization of projects and who should prioritize projects, the Council or administration, and can the administration pursue a grant for any project in the CFP. In reality, administration has a better handle on what projects they can obtain funds for. The Council may have its prioritized list but there needs to be better dialogue between the Council and the administration regarding projects administration thinks funding can be obtained for which may not necessarily match the Council's prioritized list.

Council President Buckshnis commented using \$10,000 to leverage \$320,000 was a no brainer. She agreed there may need to be a policy because this issue keeps coming up.

Councilmember Mesaros referred to Council President Buckshnis' question and asked about the current policy with regard to this set of facts. Mr. Taraday answered the Council currently adopts the budget at the fund level which gives the administration the authority to reallocate funds as long as it does not overspend the appropriation for a given fund. For example, the crosswalk, he supposed the fund language was lenient to enough allow for some reallocation within the fund.

Councilmember Mesaros relayed his understanding that the City did not receive a grant from the State for the crosswalk. Mr. Williams agreed, adding the City did not apply for a grant. Councilmember Mesaros summarized therefore the project did not have to be on the CFP or CIP because it was not a City project.

Councilmember Petso said she understood that staff can reallocate within the fund but she was not aware that staff could reallocate money to projects that are not on CFP, CIP or TIP. Mr. Taraday answered it depends on how the documents are drafted; he has not been asked to analyze whether the way the current budget is adopted gives the administration flexibility to reallocate funds to projects that are not otherwise on the list.

If the Council approves a project such as a walkway and realistically funding is easier to obtain if the project is converted into a multiuse pathway, Councilmember Petso asked whether that decision should come back to Council or does approval of a walkway also approve a change in a project to cater to a grant opportunity. Mr. Taraday answered there was a policy question and a legal question. Legally it depends on how detailed the description of the project is. For example if the capital budget says in 2014 the City will spend money on these and only these capital projects and those capital projects are very carefully detailed in a manner that do not allow a change such as from a walkway to a multiuse path, it could not be done without a budget amendment. He did not know if that had been done in the past.

Mayor Earling declared a brief recess. Council President Buckshnis distributed a suggested format for the study session.

10. STUDY SESSION REGARDING THE PLANNING BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION FOR PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES TO WESTGATE

Council President Buckshnis relayed tonight is a trial run; there will be a format in place for the next study session on October 14. She described tonight's format: a presentation from staff, followed by a

round robin of questions where each Councilmember is allowed three questions, and continuing until all questions have been answered. If time permits after all the questions have been answered, the Council can have a global discussion.

Planning Manager Rob Chave commented on the process to date including a Council public hearing on August 4, 2014. He provided examples of recent changes/adjustments:

- Clarified standards for amenity space and open space, for example clarified 15% minimum for each, clarified where these can be located
- Additional design standards for buildings
- Incentives for large retail spaces

With regard to traffic and setbacks:

- Traffic study shows no overall impact on level of service. Any future development will be analyzed for detailed traffic impacts (e.g. turning movements, access points)
- 12-foot setback preserves options; SR-104 study in last 2014/early 2015 will identify any additional recommendations for ROW improvements
- Setback requirements can be revised if needed

With regard to parking:

- Parking standards are minimums
- Added an increased parking standard (1.75 spaces per unit) for residential units that exceed 900 square feet. Achieves two goals:
 - More residential parking for larger units (that may accommodate more residents per unit)
 - Provides an added incentive for smaller units
- Proposed overall blended parking rate for commercial space is 1/500 square foot
- Existing grocery stores have a range 1 space per 350-370 square feet. Peak use is PM peak hour; much less during other parts of day
- Current usage assumes a shared parking area, not just provided onsite (e.g. QFC property has 1 space per 475 square foot)
- Comparisons with other cities show blended parking rates vary widely many at 1/500 (Mountlake Terrace, Bothell, Issaquah, Redmond, Kent), others at 1/400 (Bothell, Kent) or more. Some have no commercial requirement (Everett, Renton). Rates also vary by location within jurisdictions
- Residential parking generally varies from 0.75 or 1.0 per unit to sometimes more for larger units

Regarding lots and setbacks:

- Commercial areas provide street and residential setbacks, but not other setbacks
- Provides flexibility for locating and linking businesses

Mr. Chave displayed and described an aerial photograph of the existing QFC and PCC buildings on lot lines. He explained commercial areas provide setback in two ways, 1) from residential areas, and 2) from streets. There are no side setbacks or minimum lot sizes in commercial areas. He noted the QFC and PCC buildings were set on several of their lot lines. QFC owns their property; PCC leases their property.

He displayed an aerial photograph of the McDonalds site and described the amenity/open space versus setbacks. He provided details regarding the McDonald's property:

- 190 feet deep
- 400 feet wide
- Approx. 50 foot old front setback (actual - which includes 5-foot landscaping strip)
- Approx. 50 foot non-developed slope area
- 76,000 total lot area

- 11,400 - 15% amenity space required
- 11,400 - 15% open space
- 20,000 protected slope area 26.3% of total site
- 4,800 front 12-foot setback 6.3% of total site
- 8,000 front 20-foot setback 10.5% of total site
- **Development scenarios**

| | Existing Code | New Code |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| ○ Minimum landscape/open/amenity area | 8,000 | 31,400 |
| ○ Are available for building | 62,000 | 44,600 |
| ○ Total potential floor area | 124,000 | 133,800 |

With regard to amenity vs. open space:

- Clarified the intent to provide both amenity and open space within the area, with a 15% independent requirement for each
- Amenity space must be public, while open space can be public or private. In either case, each has its own requirement
- Note: No other zone in the City has anything like these requirements

With regard to commercial requirements:

- Clarified the various building types to indicate commercial requirements, especially regarding the commercial mixed use types:

| Building Type | Residential | Office Uses | Retail |
|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Rowhouse | Any floor | Not allowed | Not allowed |
| 2. Courtyard | Any floor | Ground floor only | Ground floor only |
| 3. Stacked Dwellings | Any floor | Ground floor only | Ground floor only |
| 4. Live-Work | Any floor | Ground floor only | Ground floor only |
| 5. Loft Mixed Use | Not ground floor | Any floor | Any floor |
| 6. Side Court Mixed Use | Not ground floor | Any floor | Ground floor only |
| 7. Commercial Mixed Use | Not ground floor | Not ground floor | Any floor |

He displayed the original and a revised building type map. With regard to building design, he explained:

- A series of design standards have been added, addressing such things as massing and articulation, orientation to the street, ground level details, pedestrian facades, blank walls and ground floor ceiling heights.
- Note that any 4th story “must be stepped back 10 feet from a building façade facing SR-104 or 100th Avenue West” (page 27)

Mr. Chave displayed illustrations in the plan, largely taken from the commercial building standards for downtown. With regard to large format retail, he explained:

- Incentives have been added for large-format retail uses (e.g. groceries, drug stores)
 - 1) Adding bonus points for large-format retail in the height bonus table (p. 38)
 - 2) A potential for 5 more feet of building height to accommodate the need for higher ceiling space in a large format retailers (the extra 5 feet is only available when a large format retail space is provided in building (page 6/7))
- Intent is for large format retail to be retained; note existing leases/ownership and Bartell’s interest in expanding their investment

Mr. Chave displayed a Height Bonus Score Sheet that identified amenities already required and items that qualified for height bonus.

Councilmember Peterson referred to Mr. Chave's statement that parking requirements are minimums. In the example of Bartell's, if they feel they need more parking to redevelop they will provide it to enhance their business. Mr. Chave identified a lot behind Bartells that was provided in anticipation of a new building. Bartells provided more parking than they needed in anticipation of that additional development which did not occur due to the economy.

Councilmember Peterson commented there is a certain point in development where the developer makes their decision; if the City does not overly restrict, the market will dictate what is required. Mr. Chave answered one aspect of the market is the developer's experience or the store's experience with the type of parking they need. A second factor is the bank/investor looks closely at the market, access and parking. The final phase is ensuring the proposal meets the City's parking standards. If the parking standards are too tight, it can halt the process at the beginning particularly with infill in existing areas. In Bartell's case, they have a well-defined site and parking; they have a strong interest in providing sufficient parking for their store.

Mr. Chase commented another significant issue is the existing investments and ownership patterns. Bartells is in the process acquiring the entire corner; they currently only own store. QFC owns their property and have a strong interest in providing sufficient parking. QFC did a significant interior remodel approximately five years ago and is a very successful store even with PCC across the street. He did not fore see any of the main anchors, PCC, QFC or Bartells, moving out any time soon because they very successful.

Councilmember Petso asked if there was any requirement that the entire first floor of the Type 7 buildings be commercial versus tuck-under or semi-underground parking. Mr. Chave did not recall any specific numbers.

Councilmember Petso asked why amenity space was allowed to be in the setback area or six feet underground or six feet above ground. If the amenity space was in the setback area, she feared it may be close to the road. If the amenity space is underground or above ground, it may be nearly inaccessible and potentially invisible to passersby. She asked why that type of the amenity would be desired. Mr. Chave answered the reason for the six-foot requirement was to bring it down, close to the ground. In areas that have this type of amenity space such as plazas, there are frequently multiple levels, integrated seating, or a multi-functional plaza that serves as an outdoor amphitheater. The intent of the six feet was to make it pedestrian scale but also provide flexibility with regard to how the space was arranged. A requirement for ground floor would not provide for that type of varied areas.

With regard to the setback, in the McDonald's example, Mr. Chave explained if there is a 12-foot front setback there is already a reserved area behind near the slope; adding the amenity space leaves very little site area. The area cannot be used for parking and a McDonald's is not going to have parking under the building which may rule out a use like a McDonald's. Many sites will be hard pressed to satisfy the amenity space requirement even if the amenity space is in the front. If a walkway is provided near the right-of-way, for example the new landscaping/walkway area in front of Walgreens, the walkway is wider than the usual 4-5 feet. Near Walgreens there is a 5-foot planting area and a 7-foot wide walkway. The right-of-way was only 10 feet; in order to construct the additional walkway, an easement was obtained from the property owner to expand the walkway. The sidewalk does not count as amenity space; they still have to provide the 15%.

Councilmember Petso asked why language was added during this latest update that the buildings may not stand in isolation (page 193), noting it would seem to contribute to the side-lot to side-lot corridor effect down SR-104 and along 100th. Mr. Chave recalled that language was added to clarify that buildings need to be connected to the other buildings, sidewalks and walkways and not standing in isolation. Mr. Taraday

recalled that was added to clarify other language. Councilmember Petso asked why that was desirable, to have buildings connected along the stretch. Mr. Chave clarified it was not buildings physically connected wall to wall, the intent was connectivity between the buildings such as walkways, pathways, connected drives, etc. He suggested clarifying the language if that was not clear.

Council President Buckshnis said having the amenity space stratified is great, referring to downtown Lake Oswego. She asked whether there was an art aspect to the amenity space. Mr. Chave answered language could be included that encourages art as part of the amenity space or added to the score sheet.

Council President Buckshnis relayed she understood the concept of not having buildings stand in isolation. Mr. Chave commented the concept will fail if there is a building in a large parking and no way to get to from that building to buildings nearby. Council President Buckshnis commented PCC was very successful, they have a 30 year lease but their building is isolated. Mr. Chave agreed it was somewhat isolated but they have areas in front. The intent with redevelopment is things like changes in the paving and trees planted along walkways to identify the location of the walkway. Businesses like PCC may be willing to partner with the City.

Council President Buckshnis referred to the old fashioned sidewalks along SR-104. She asked whether the plan includes streetscapes with trees between the roadway and sidewalk to separate pedestrians from the traffic. Mr. Chave agreed yes, referring to the newer scheme in front of Walgreens and the multifamily development near Compass that separates pedestrians from the roadway.

Councilmember Johnson commented last week the Council authorized the SR-104 which has a Westgate emphasis. She asked how the results of the Westgate Transportation Study will be incorporated into the City's Comprehensive Plan. Development Services Director Shane Hope explained the SR-104 study will occur late 2014/early 2015. By that time she assumed the code would be adopted along with the minor changes to the 2014 Comprehensive Plan. The analysis will then come back for review by the Planning Board, Transportation Committee and City Council and elements will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan via the Transportation Element or other plans such as the Streetscape Plan. Any potential code changes could also be adopted at that time. Councilmember Johnson commented it was important for the public to understand the two will eventually be connected.

Councilmember Johnson commented the purpose and intent of the Westgate code calls for designing a landscape emphasis at the primary intersection of SR-104 & 100th/9th. Regardless of whether the existing 20-foot setback is retained or the proposed 12-foot setback adopted, she asked how the landscape emphasis will be achieved at the intersection. Mr. Chave commented the additional setback which will result in the buildings being quite low. It may be worthwhile to add language regarding signature plaza spaces and water features in addition to landscaping. He agreed that was an important concept, visitors should have a feeling that they have arrived somewhere.

Councilmember Johnson observed SR-104 has a natural environment notable for tall stands of evergreen trees. She asked how the green factors score sheet could be modified if there was a desire for greater emphasis on native trees. Mr. Chave responded one of the reasons for the protected slopes was due to the location of the large evergreens. An option would be to increase the points in the table for native vegetation. There is a significant bonus for protecting existing trees. Councilmember Johnson observed the bonus is 1 for bio-retention, .8 for protecting large existing trees and .1 for native. She suggested increasing the bonus for native trees. Mr. Chave commented on the interaction between the protected slopes and the emphasis on protecting trees in general; the bonus could be increased for protecting native species.

Councilmember Bloom observed the proposal was to allow 4 stories on the Bartell property with a 12-foot setback and an additional 5 feet in height would be allowed for 15,000 square feet. Mr. Chave agreed. Councilmember Bloom observed the building could not be subdivided below 15,000 square feet of retail space for the life of building. She asked how that would be enforced. Mr. Chave said it would need to be provided upfront and the City sees all tenant improvements; any tenant improvement that would divide the space below 15,000 square feet would be denied. Mr. Taraday advised there would likely be something recorded against the title of any property taking advantage of the 15,000 square foot height bonus to create a permanent record on the title that so all future permit applications would be reviewed in light of that restriction.

Councilmember Bloom observed commercial mixed use was allowed on all properties, other uses are sprinkled throughout and some quadrants only allow a portion of commercial mixed use for example QFC. There was concern expressed at her Town Hall meeting about a tunnel effect if every property were developed commercial mixed use and located 12 feet from the road. Mr. Chave said the idea of tunnel was the vertical space relative to the horizontal space. He referred to downtown where there is a 60-foot right-of-way, an average of 30 foot building on both sides with no setbacks. At Westgate there is an 80-foot right-of-way, 12-foot setback and 35 foot buildings with the potential of an additional 10-15 feet of height. He summarized in terms of scale to the right-of-way, the buildings in Westgate were similar to the overall proportion of downtown. He did not see that as having a tunnel effect.

Councilmember Bloom asked if there was a reason for allowing commercial mixed use on every property when QFC and PCC were not likely to redevelop. Mr. Chave commented there was a misconception about what that means, pointing out QFC, PCC, McDonalds are commercial buildings although they are different shapes and sizes and if they had residential, they would be commercial mixed use. The idea is not one size fits all; commercial mixed use buildings will each look different, especially at the intersection where a stepback is required on a 4-story building. That combined with the design standards that require differentiating the ground floor from the upper floors, the appearance of separate sections even in a larger building, etc. that will interact to mitigate the fear of a tunnel look to the development.

Councilmember Bloom commented Mr. Barber, who owns Bartells, was at the Town Hall meeting and was very concerned about the parking. Recalling a conversation she and Councilmember Petso had with Mr. Doherty, Ms. Hope and Mr. Chave, she asked whether the plan could start with the Bartells quadrant, work on that quadrant with Bartells, and do the other quadrants later once the SR-104 transportation study is completed since they are unlikely to redevelop. Ms. Hope responded anything is possible. Her understanding was there has been a deliberative process over 3-4 years to look at all 4 quadrants and how they affect each other. Although each quadrant could be considered separately, there is value in having a plan that works reasonably for all four quadrants and fine-tune it based on development that occurs in one of the quadrants.

Councilmember Bloom relayed concerns expressed at the Town Hall meeting included traffic patterns, crossing SR-104 and 100th, parking, ingress and egress, existing parking difficulties at QFC, and driving from QFC to PCC. She summarized pedestrian crossing is not convenient and that is something the SR-104 study will consider. Ms. Hope responded some of the traffic issues have been studied and it may be that perception is not the same as what is actually proposed. The SR-104 analysis will be done within a few months and a lot of the concerns will be addressed.

Councilmember Mesaros observed QFC's existing parking is 1/475 square feet. He inquired about PCC's parking ratio. Mr. Chave answered it is approximately 1/350 square feet in the area immediately in front. Most commercial areas have blended/spill over parking. Councilmember Mesaros inquired about Goodwill's parking ratio. Mr. Chave answered it is shared parking.

Councilmember Mesaros said he has heard canyon-effect mentioned and appreciated Mr. Chave's comparison of the right-of-way and buildings in Westgate to downtown. He asked whether the proposed zoning allow would allow 4-story buildings all along the corridor. Mr. Chave identified areas where 4, 3, and 2 story buildings would be allowed, noting it is not a uniform 4 stories.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas observed heights up to 4 stories would be allowed at the cross of the quadrants at Edmonds Way and 100th/9th. Mr. Chave identified 2 sides where 4-story buildings would be allowed and 2 sides where 3-story buildings would be allowed. Councilmember Fraley-Monillas observed it could potentially feel like canyon or tunnel in the center. Mr. Chave did not think so, particularly with the stepback at the intersection.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas commented she liked the walkability of University Village, recalling the series of roads through University Village in the past. She asked the timeframe for making a decision on this plan. Mr. Chave envisioned Thanksgiving. He feared if a decision was delayed too long, it would take a backseat to the budget.

Councilmember Peterson agreed it is not comfortable walk on the sidewalk on SR-104 but the concept via redevelopment in 20-30 years is to create internal walkability and a pedestrian friendly shopping and living experience. Mr. Chave agreed, noting the raised sidewalks in U-Village clearly identify the pedestrian areas.

To Councilmember Bloom suggestion to do one quadrant at a time, Councilmember Peterson asked whether that would be a radical change to the Planning Board's recommendation and require restarting the public process and holding another public hearing. Mr. Taraday answered worst case scenario another public hearing would need to be held to ensure the GMA requirement for public participation was met. As a practical matter, because the other properties are unlikely to redevelop it may not matter whether a plan for the entire area is adopted and tweaked later or only a plan for the quadrant that is likely to develop sooner. Mr. Chave explained it was within the Council discretion to do a phased approach; however, it is unknown what the property owners outside the SR-104 & 100th/9th intersection are considering. The City is limited in what it can do to improve the flow and access until some redevelopment occurs.

Council President Buckshnis asked whether there were grant funds available for overpasses between the quadrants. She referred to overpasses in Charlotte. Ms. Hope answered there are no grants available in Washington for that at this time. She agreed connectivity between the quadrants was an important element. Mr. Taraday suggested an overpass could be added to the amenity score sheet for a height bonus; it was more likely to occur that way rather than via grant funding. Council President Buckshnis asked if there was a percentage of residential in the plan. Ms. Hope answered for example residential cannot be on the first floor. Some property owners may prefer office space to commercial.

Council President Buckshnis asked how Councilmembers should inform staff of additional incentives. Ms. Hope suggested sending information to staff to allow further research. Council President Buckshnis suggested adding art.

Councilmember Johnson observed properties in the Westgate area have varied height limits depending on the location and topography. She asked the Planning Board's rationale for four stories in the QFC quadrant where there is flat topography. Mr. Chave displayed the height map, explaining there are no slopes in the QFC area but the cemetery separates the site from the surrounding area. Four stories were not allowed in the northeast due to its small size.

Councilmember Johnson referred to the intersection analysis done by Jennifer Barnes in June 2013 for the SR-104/100th intersection. She asked Mr. Chave to contrast that analysis with the new transportation

study of Westgate with regard to the forecast years, land use assumptions and the scope of work. Mr. Chave answered Ms. Barnes supplemented the analysis in the Transportation Plan where the planning horizon is 2025, analyzing overall volumes, turning movements, levels of service, signalization, etc. The 2015 update will expand the horizon to 2035. The UW's analysis assumed 4-5 stories; the impact of the current 2-4 story plan will be substantially less.

Councilmember Johnson observed Ms. Barnes' analysis was of the intersection; the transportation study will consider other components. Mr. Chave agreed, especially the SR-104 study.

Councilmember Bloom referred page 7c regarding building not standing in isolation, specifically the last sentence that states, will achieve these connectivity and space-shaping goals more effectively by allowing such an exception in light of the established building and circulation pattern, provided that vehicle parking shall not be located between the building and the public street in any instance. She asked whether the eventual goal was no parking in front of QFC or PCC and for buildings to be located up to the street. Mr. Chave answered the intent is to form the spaces for parking and pedestrian circulation in the area internal to the quadrant by the placement of the buildings. The old strip mall model is parking lot in front with buildings set back with a sign identifying the tenants. When buildings are closer to the sidewalk, they provide a presence at the street front.

Councilmember Bloom observed the goal of the plan was for all buildings to be close to the street. Mr. Chave answered all the buildings would not be at the street because the property configuration of some would not allow the buildings to be placed at the street. The general principle is to have the buildings at the street. If the buildings are not at the street, there will be limited ability to create interconnected spaces, aisles and driveways behind the buildings.

Councilmember Bloom asked whether there was any accommodation made for bike trails. Mr. Chave answered they are not precluded, they could be provided as part of the connections but would be limited by space. The emphasis is along 9th because it is a challenge to provide a bike trail to the east. The north and east connectors in the City's existing bike plans are further north. The language regarding internal circulation could be expanded to emphasize bikes.

Councilmember Bloom referred to language in the plan regarding units less than 900 square feet, a percentage allowed to be over 1600 square and encouraging affordable housing. She emphasize that was not affordable housing; affordable housing was when a person paid no more than 1/3 of their income for housing. As it appeared there was interest in providing affordable housing at Westgate, she asked why actual affordable housing was not included in the plan. Mr. Chave explained the City did not have an affordable housing program; there was no zoning regulation to require affordable housing in a development. He and Ms. Hope have discussed developing that type of program but it would take a couple years including working with the Housing Authority and the new Affordable Housing Alliance (AHA) of Snohomish County. If such a program were developed, it could be added to the Westgate plan; another potential location is nodes on Hwy 99 that are close to transit.

COUNCILMEMBER BLOOM MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT BUCKSHNIS, TO EXTEND THE MEETING TO 10:15 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Councilmember Johnson referred to the proposal to maintain 15,000 square feet for the life of a building and observed that would preclude the old Albertsons from being dividing to provide space for a pet store as well as prohibit the former Safeway from being developed as Salish Crossing. She questioned whether that was a good idea. Mr. Chave answered the developer would have to be seeking the fourth story for that requirement to be imposed. Second, it would only require 15,000 square feet; for example if the old Albertsons had 20,000 square feet, they could designate 15,000 for PCC and the remainder for other stores. Mayor Earling suggested for future study session discussions, staff be seated at the table.

Councilmember Petso advised she would email staff with a number of requests for future presentations. She suggested deleting the provision that allow using a portion of the sidewalk in the public right-of-way for outdoor seating, temporary displays, etc. Although currently allowed downtown, it would not make sense on SR-104. Council President Buckshnis commented it may not be appropriate on SR-104 but it could be appropriate in other areas in Westgate.

Councilmember Petso suggested a requirement that the first floor be devoted to retail and not parking. As examples she referred to the Compass Apartments where parking is provided in back under the units and a building in Shoreline near Costco where there most of the ground floor is parking. She feared turning a vibrant business district into parking holding up residential. Council President Buckshnis referred to the parking configuration allowed downtown. Councilmember Petso answered there is already a walkable pedestrian area downtown. She relayed comments about why the City wants to create a second walkable pedestrian area. She wanted to ensure Westgate retained legitimate commercial uses on the first floor.

Councilmember Johnson inquired about parking on 9th in front of the cemetery, assuming it was employee parking. She asked whether consideration had been given to offsite parking for employees to better accommodate customer parking. Councilmember Fraley-Monillas commented it is also commuter parking for people taking the bus because there are no time limits on the parking in that area.

Council President Buckshnis clarified smaller units can be affordable housing. She envisioned a walkable neighborhood with residential away from SR-104. Councilmember Bloom pointed out affordable housing has a specific definition, there is no guarantee a 900 square foot unit is affordable. She agreed with Council President Buckshnis' suggestion to have residential setback from SR-104 but that was not what this plan proposed. The plan allows commercial mixed use everywhere and only one of the residential uses, rowhouses, was strictly residential; everything else is mixed use including the live-work. She preferred to designate where residential is allowed and that it be setback and private. This plan allows buildings up to 4 stories of mixed use at the Bartell and QFC mixed use with 3 stories of residential and 1 floor of commercial and parking to accommodate the uses. Council President Buckshnis did not support designating where specific building types could be located.

Councilmember Peterson referred to the presentation by Mark Smith, AHA, who pointed out there are a number of striations to affordable housing including what the private sector provides and what the City could provide via an affordable housing program. Mr. Smith indicated Edmonds is woefully inadequate in both regards; the affordable housing the private sector provides is typically smaller units. Encouraging smaller units in Westgate and throughout the City is an excellent way for the private sector to provide affordable housing. If housing was restricted to specific areas such as rowhouses that are private, it automatically increases the footprint and the price and would eliminate the sector of affordable housing that can be provided by the private sector. The more the location of housing is restricted, the worse the opportunity for providing any type of affordable housing. This type of development is needed throughout the City; there are opportunities in Westgate, downtown, Hwy 99 and Five Corners.

Councilmember Petso agreed small units are not affordable housing and recalled Mr. Smith saying that. There may be less construction costs but the smaller size does not make them affordable housing particularly for families who cannot live in a small unit. She relayed the public wants to identify the places at Westgate where they are willing to accept taller building and residential units and not interfere with other areas at Westgate; that is not what this plan does.

11. REPORT ON OUTSIDE BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Due to the late hour, this item was postponed to a future meeting.

12. MAYOR'S COMMENTS

Mayor Earling reported he, several staff and citizens attended a reception today for Gary Haakenson's retirement from Snohomish County.

13. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Council President Buckshnis thanked the Council for trying the study session. She invited Councilmembers' suggestion for future study sessions such as a timeframe for questions instead of the round robin. Establishing a format will be on the October 14 agenda.

Councilmember Johnson reminded of the Edmonds Downtown Business Improvement District's premiere of the Ed! program at their luncheon tomorrow, Snohomish County Tomorrow's annual meeting tomorrow and the Tour of the Marsh on October 4 at 10:30 a.m.

Councilmember Fraley-Monillas advised she was in Cabo during the recent hurricane.

14. CONVENE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION REGARDING PENDING OR POTENTIAL LITIGATION PER RCW 42.30.110(1)(i)

This item was not needed.

15. RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION. POTENTIAL ACTION AS A RESULT OF MEETING IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

This item was not needed.

16. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Council meeting was adjourned at 10:16 p.m.